1 2 3 4 5	MATTHEW D. ZINN (State Bar No. 21 AARON M. STANTON (State Bar No. 3 SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER L 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 552-7272 Facsimile: (415) 552-5816 Zinn@smwlaw.com Stanton@smwlaw.com	312530)
6	Attorneys for Defendants County of Alameda and Yesenia Sanchez	
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
L0		
l1 l2		
13		
ا 14	JOSE ANTONIO GARCIA,	Case No. 3:24-cv-3997-RS
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER CONTINUING DEADLINE FOR
լ6 լ7	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA and YESENIA SANCHEZ, Sheriff of	DEFENDANTS' RESPONSIVE PLEADING AND CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
18	Alameda County, in her official capacity,	The Hon. Richard Seeborg
19	Defendants.	Trial Date: None Set
20		I
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
ואי	1	

pleading because the Court's order on the PI Motion would inform Defendants' decision whether to answer the Complaint or move to dismiss and could avoid the WHEREAS, on August 1, 2024, the Court granted the parties' stipulated request to allow Defendants to file their response to the complaint within 30 days WHEREAS, the Court thereafter continued the Case Management Conference to December 12, 2024 (Doc. No. 21), and then to January 9, 2025 (Doc. WHEREAS, the Court issued an Order Denying Motion for Preliminary Injunction ("PI Order") on October 11, 2024, concluding that Plaintiff "is unlikely to WHEREAS, based on the date of the PI Order, Defendants' responsive WHEREAS, Plaintiff is considering whether to amend the complaint or take an appeal from the PI Order, and the deadline for filing such an appeal is WHEREAS, Defendants contend that the Court's reasoning in the PI Order effectively disposes of Plaintiff's claims in this action, and Defendants therefore expect to file a motion to dismiss; STIPULATION AND ORDER CONTINUING DEADLINES Case No.

27

28

WHEREAS, insofar as Plaintiff's decision whether to amend or appeal may determine whether a motion to dismiss is necessary, and because Defendants wish to avoid the expense of such a motion, the parties agree it will conserve the resources of the parties and the Court to extend Defendants' deadline for filing a motion; and

WHEREAS, the parties agree that the need for a Case Management Conference may be obviated by the parties' decisions about an amendment, appeal, and motion to dismiss, and they therefore propose to continue the Case Management Conference and related deadlines;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court order that:

- 1. The time for Defendants to file a responsive pleading is extended by 30 days to December 12, 2024.
- 2. The Case Management Conference is continued approximately 60 days to March 13, 2025.
- 3. All deadlines related to the Case Management Conference are continued accordingly.

I hereby attest that all other signatories listed, and on whose behalf this stipulation is submitted, concur in this stipulation's content and have authorized its filing.

DATED: October 31, 2024 SHUTE, MIHALY & WEINBERGER LLP

By: /s/Matthew D. Zinn
MATTHEW D. ZINN
AARON M. STANTON

Attorneys for Defendants County of Alameda and Yesenia Sanchez

1		
$\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$	DATED: October 31, 2024 FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION	
3		
4	By: /s/David Loy	
5	DAVID LOY ANN CAPPETTA	
6		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff Jose Antonio Garcia	
8		
9	ORDER	
10		
11	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12		
13	DATED: October 31 , 2024	
$egin{array}{c c} 14 & & \\ 15 & & \end{array}$	Will Seeling	
16	The Hon. Richard Seeberg	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	4	
	·	